

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and
Social Sciences

Great Plains Studies, Center for

February 1992

Tenth Great Plains Wildlife Damage Control Workshop

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch>



Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

"Tenth Great Plains Wildlife Damage Control Workshop" (1992). *Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*. 41.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch/41>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Great Plains Studies, Center for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

TENTH GREAT PLAINS WILDLIFE DAMAGE CONTROL WORKSHOP

The Tenth Great Plains Wildlife Damage Control Workshop (GPWDCW) was held 15-18 April 1991 in Lincoln, Nebraska. The goal was to provide a forum for individuals involved in wildlife damage management to discuss new ideas and recent advances in ecology, technology, public education, and policy. The format allowed for interaction and exchange on current issues, damage control techniques, priority areas for research, public education, and extension activities. The GPWDCW is one of three national conferences (including the Vertebrate Pest Conference and the Eastern Wildlife Damage Control Conference) that deal specifically with wildlife damage management.

More than 250 people from 22 states and two provinces participated. Most participants were responsible for management, administration, or extension duties in federal, state, or provincial agencies, or in educational institutions. Others reported responsibilities including research, regulation, commerce, teaching, consulting, policy, and production. Most participants were involved with wildlife damage management in relation to agriculture (especially livestock, field crops, cash crops, nurseries, and fruit crops) and dealt with damage caused by predators, birds, field rodents, ungulates, and commensal rodents.

The focus of this year's workshop and general session was *Wildlife Damage Management and the Public*. The keynote address, delivered by Gary J. San Julian, Vice-President of Research and Education for the National Wildlife Federation, dealt with the need to identify current audiences and to define changing roles as natural resource professionals in today's society. This message was accentuated by Rick D. Owens (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Animal Damage Control; USDA-APHIS-ADC), who presented a thesis that highlighted environmentalism and animal welfare as cornerstones of wildlife damage management. During the same session, two administrative leaders, James E. Miller (USDA-Extension Service) and Bobby R. Accord (USDA-APHIS-ADC), delivered presentations that provided guidance for the future of the

field. Jeffrey S. Green (USDA-APHIS-ADC) discussed the role of education and the public's understanding of wildlife damage management, with particular emphasis on youth. In addition, Alice P. Wywialowski (USDA-APHIS-ADC) presented a pertinent and timely description of the animal rights movement and discussed its implications on society and the field of wildlife damage management. These solicited papers were instrumental in establishing the theme of the workshop--that wildlife damage management is a necessary and timely field that must continue to evolve to meet the changing needs of society.

Thirty-two contributed papers presented in seven sessions covered a wide variety of subjects, including predators, rodents, birds, special programs and projects, general management, and USDA-APHIS activities. Ecological/behavioral papers provided detailed information on coyotes (*Canis latrans*), black-tailed prairie dogs (*Cynomys ludovicianus*), burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*), double-crested cormorants (*Phalacrocorax auritis*), plains pocket gophers (*Geomys bursarius*), deer mice (*Peromyscus maniculatus*), Canada geese (*Branta canadensis*), elk (*Cervus elaphus*), and others. Methods-related papers illustrated the search that continues for new products and the imaginative uses of old products. Presentations addressed livestock protection collars, barrier fences, field rodent toxicants, monofilament lines, repellents, and computer-assisted decision-making models. Dale Rollins (Texas Agricultural Extension Service) showed two videos on public perceptions of coyotes and coyote control. Leonard Askham (Washington State University) presented a dynamic three-dimensional, computer-generated image of subterranean vole burrows—a real eye-opener. The session on USDA-APHIS activities addressed a variety of new programs, cooperative efforts, and activities pertaining to wildlife damage management. Current activities include the Utah State University extension and instructional program, USDA-APHIS and Cooperative Extension joint public education projects, USDA-APHIS-ADC compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, and research projects conducted through the USDA-APHIS-Denver Wildlife Research Center.

One highlight of this year's workshop was student involvement and recognition of students who made presentations. The National Animal

Damage Control Association (NADCA) sponsored an Outstanding Student Awards program that recognized the three best papers presented by students. Six students participated in the program. Kimberly K. Kessler (University of Nebraska-Lincoln) won top honors with her presentation entitled, "Lines to Selectively Repel House Sparrows from Backyard Feeders." Other award winners were John L. Koprowski (University of Kansas) with, "Damage Due to Scent Marking by Eastern Gray and Fox Squirrels," and Bruce A. Jasch (University of Nebraska-Lincoln) with, "A Cultural Method of Reducing Pocket Gopher Impact on Alfalfa Yields." Kim received a plaque from Terrell P. Salmon, President, NADCA and all were awarded an autographed copy of *Prevention and Control of Wildlife Damage*. In addition, 20 undergraduate students enrolled in a course on wildlife damage management at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln served as workshop hosts, assisting with registration, audio-visual projection, field tours, displays, and transportation. Their service provided a unique opportunity to meet many of the leaders in the field of wildlife damage management.

The workshop concluded with a session on professionalism. The session was closely linked with the opening session and provided many thought-provoking ideas. Robert S. Cook (Colorado State University) discussed the evolution of wildlife damage management and the search for a name that would best convey our image and activities to the public. Terrell P. Salmon (University of California-Davis) discussed the legal, political, and social aspects of the field, and Jay B. McAninch (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources) challenged the audience to evaluate themselves and to adapt to new challenges in a presentation entitled, "Wildlife Damage Management in the 90s—Does the Professional Fit the Profession?" It was a strong but necessary message for members of a profession that must work in an often controversial atmosphere yet meet growing and changing demands for professional assistance with wildlife conflict situations.

Prior to the formal sessions, a field trip included stops at the Platte River near Grand Island to view migrating Sandhill cranes (*Grus canadensis*); the USDA Meat Animal Research Center near Clay Center and a portion of the Rainwater Basin area to view migrating waterfowl. Gary Lingle (Platte River Whooping Crane Trust) spoke on management and environmental concerns

in regard to the cranes on the Platte, Kirk E. Gustad (USDA-APHIS-Nebraska Animal Damage Control), discussed predator problems and control activities at the Meat Animal Research Center, and Richard A. Gersib (Nebraska Game and Parks Commission) spoke about habitat loss and management in the Rainwater Basin.

To evaluate the workshop, participants completed questionnaires that were included in the registration packets. Fifty-six useable questionnaires were returned and overall they were very complimentary. When asked what they liked most about the workshop in general, respondents reported the overall organization (23%), facilities/accommodations (23%), and the location (20%). Others liked the social and recreational aspects, as well as the student award program, and the professionalism of participants. When asked the same about subject sessions, most respondents reported the diversity of subjects and speakers (39%), keeping on time (20%), and the opening session on Wildlife Damage Management and the Public (18%). Others liked the subject sessions, breaks, room controls, and absence of concurrent sessions. When asked what they liked least about the workshop in general, the most frequent response was "nothing" (23%). When asked the same about the subject sessions, respondents reported on the absence of practical information (16%), session papers (11%), and the lack of concurrent sessions (9%). Ninety-four percent of the respondents reported that the information presented at the workshop was very useful or somewhat useful.

Overall, the workshop was successful in achieving its objectives. It provided a forum for the exchange of information and ideas among individuals of the public and private sectors associated with wildlife damage management. It highlighted the importance of defining and dealing with various audiences and provided information on new approaches and new solutions aimed at safe, cost-effective, and socially-acceptable wildlife damage control. Participants recognized the need to continue to foster professionalism and to be aware of, and responsive to, the changing needs and issues in wildlife damage management. The workshop proceedings can be purchased by sending \$15.00 per copy (check, purchase order, or money order) to: Proceedings, 202 Natural Resources Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68583-0819 (phone 402/472-6822).

The Eleventh GPWDCW will meet on 26-29 April 1993 in Kansas City, Missouri. Contact F. Robert Henderson (Kansas State University) or Robert A. Pierce (University of Missouri-Columbia) for information.

Scott E. Hygnstrom

Ronald M. Case

Ron J. Johnson

Department of Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

COLLOQUIUM ON SUSTAINABLE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Since the late 1980s, the focus of much thinking on how to integrate environmental concern and economic growth in an ethical and equitable manner has shifted from a preoccupation with the hinterland to a human settlements perspective. On a cold Saturday morning in November 1991, some 50 academics, urban professionals, government officials, and students gathered to explore issues related to sustainable housing and urban development at a one-day colloquium hosted by the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Winnipeg.

A full slate of six presentations, as well as a keynote address, was offered. The keynote speaker, Mr. Claude Bennett, Chairman of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) in Ottawa, announced that the Corporation would renew its funding commitment to the Institute of Urban Studies for 1991-92. David D'Amour (CMHC) introduced the background of the concept of sustainable development, and described some of CMHC's current research and initiatives towards sustainable housing for Canadians. D'Amour argued that the challenge of sustainable housing has economic,

social, and ecological implications, and that the prevailing planning paradigm must shift from technocentric (utilitarian, cost/benefit) decision-making to a more ecocentric approach.

Phil Wichern (Department of Political Studies, University of Manitoba) exposed the gap between what is being said and what is being done at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels of government with regard to sustainable urban development. Wichern suggested that, with a few exceptions (e.g., the City of Ottawa's new official plan, based on sustainable development principles), governments' commitment to sustainable development is more political window-dressing than concrete policies and programs. William R. Code (Director of the Urban Development Program, University of Western Ontario) was equally provocative in his discussion of the relativity of sustainability. Code challenged the received wisdom that the residential intensification of downtown areas is the key to urban sustainability. Consumer preference for single-detached, low-density suburban housing is so entrenched, Code argued, that buyers would seek exurban housing rather than settle for expensive, inner-city dwellings. Code suggested the multinodal city, with better designed, multi-use suburbs, as an alternative to inner-city densification.

Julie Tasker-Brown, (Energy Pathways, Inc., Ottawa) asked whether sustainable objectives can be achieved with current planning regulations. Tasker-Brown identified some key characteristics of sustainable communities, and proposed corresponding regulatory changes to bring about change in the direction of sustainability, such as increasing densities and compactness by relaxing zoning restrictions. CMHC's Affordability and Choice Today (ACT) program was offered as an example of community sustainable development policy in action. ACT funds housing demonstration projects, streamlining of development approval processes, and performance evaluations of regulatory initiatives.

Ian MacBurnie (Atelier Arcadia, Montreal) returned to the theme of the suburb. MacBurnie, an architect, is undertaking a CMHC-sponsored study of suburbia, consisting of an historical review of the concept of the suburb, and an alternative paradigm to be tested on a greenfield site in Mississauga, Ontario. Like Code, MacBurnie held that the suburb, while

flawed, can be fixed through more sustainable design features such as gridded streets and lanes and mixed-density, multi-use blocks.

In the final presentation Mark Roseland (Centre for Human Settlements, University of British Columbia) discussed a framework for linking affordable housing and environmental protection. Roseland offered an incisive critique of the Brundtland version of sustainable development, and offered one example of how equity considerations can be integrated into urban development, the Community Land Trust, a model that has met with such success in US communities. Roseland argued that truly sustainable development would reduce the need for environmental protection, rather than simply tacking on environmental concerns to economic activity. In urban settings, Community Land Trusts can help to achieve this objective by combatting speculation and gentrification, preserving and developing low- and moderate-income housing, and by maintaining urban open spaces. In rural communities, CLTs can provide access to land and housing for low-income people, preserve farms and farmland, and enable sound, long-term land and forest management.

Each presentation was followed by a lively, half-hour discussion and debate between the presenters and other participants, thus making the event a genuine colloquium. Some common themes that emerged were: the apparent tension between urban intensification and multinucleation; the need for regulatory change; and the necessity of real political commitment at all levels of government to sustainable development policies and programs. There was enough agreement among the presenters--and in the new and extensive literature on sustainable cities and communities--to suggest an emerging consensus on sustainable urban development principles such as intensification and mixed or multi-uses in both urban and suburban settings, better use of existing built forms, affordable housing, work and recreation in local areas. While isolated programs, policies and initiatives designed to implement some of these goals exist, real on-the-ground progress towards integrating environment, equity, and economics in Canadian communities is still piecemeal at best (Rees and Roseland 1991; Tomalty and Hendler 1991). As Wichern forcefully pointed out in his presentation, political action at all levels must replace rhetorical commitment to sustainable development. I

would add that public education on how city dwellers can enhance environmental quality by making sustainable consumer choices in housing, transportation, recreation—and government—is an essential element in the quest for the sustainable community.

Proceedings of the Colloquium will be published in 1992.

References

- Rees, W. E. and M. Roseland. 1991. Sustainable communities: Planning for the 21st century. *Plan Canada* 31: 15-26.
- Tomalty, R. and S. Hendler. 1991. Green planning: Striving towards sustainable development in Ontario's municipalities. *Plan Canada* 31: 27-32.

Mary Ann Beavis
Institute of Urban Studies
University of Winnipeg